

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

IN RE:

GENERAL MOTORS LLC IGNITION  
SWITCH LITIGATION

No. 14-MD-2543 (JMF)

This Document Relates to:

*ALL ECONOMIC LOSS ACTIONS*

**DECLARATION OF ELIZABETH J. CABRASER IN SUPPORT OF  
INTERIM CLASS COUNSEL'S RULE 23(h) MOTION FOR APPROVAL OF AWARD  
OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND EXPENSES**

I, Elizabeth J. Cabraser, declare under penalty of perjury as follows:

1. I am a partner at Lief, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP (“Lief Cabraser”). I respectfully submit this Declaration in support of Interim Class Counsel’s Rule 23(h) Motion for Approval of Award of Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses (“Fee Motion”). I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein and, if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently to them.

2. Pursuant to Order No. 8, *In re Gen. Motors LLC Ignition Switch Litig.*, Case No. 14-md-02543-JMF (S.D.N.Y. 2014), I serve as Plaintiffs’ Co-Lead Counsel with particular responsibility for the Economic Loss part of the MDL Action, along with Steve W. Berman, of Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP (“Hagens Berman”). On April 27, 2020, this Court further appointed me as interim Class Counsel for the Settlement Class, along with Mr. Berman. Dkt. No. 7877.

### **Overview**

3. Rule 23(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides in relevant part that “[i]n a certified class action, the court may award reasonable attorney’s fees and nontaxable costs<sup>1</sup> that are authorized by law or by the parties’ agreement.” The Fee Motion here is in support of the \$34.5 million in fees and costs that Class Plaintiffs (“Plaintiffs”) seek in connection with the class action settlement (“Settlement”) that was preliminarily approved by this Court on April 27, 2020.

4. The Settlement provides for a non-reversionary Settlement Fund of \$121.1 million. Additionally, pursuant to mediator-supervised negotiations, the settling defendants have agreed to pay \$34.5 million in class Counsel fees and costs, subject to Court approval. As

---

<sup>1</sup> In this Declaration, I use “costs” and “expenses” interchangeably.

discussed in the accompanying memorandum of law, Plaintiffs' fee request is only 16.8% of the net constructive common fund (the Settlement Fund plus the fees and costs that New GM has agreed to pay, minus costs). This is well within—indeed, lower than—the percentage regularly approved in the Second Circuit for class action settlements.

5. A “cross-check” comparing the requested fees with the aggregate lodestar (total number of economic loss class claim-related hours at timekeepers' customary hourly rates), and an examination of the aggregate out-of-pocket economic loss class-related costs, underscores the fairness and reasonableness of awarding Plaintiffs the \$34.5 million they are seeking. This Declaration describes the processes and requirements for gathering and reporting lodestar and costs in the MDL, and, separately, how Plaintiffs determined the costs and the lodestar figure used for this specific cross-check under Rule 23 of the portion of the time and costs relevant to the class action fee award.

6. This MDL has comprised two distinct components: (1) a number of individual personal injury and wrongful death cases, most of which have been resolved, and many of which have generated recoveries on which individual attorneys were paid under contingency fee contracts, and which are subject to a common benefit assessment under Order No. 42 (Establishing Common Benefit Fee and Expense Fund); and (2) the economic loss class action claims, embodied in a series of consolidated amended class action complaints filed in this MDL, which the instant proposed class action settlement would resolve, and in connection with which this Rule 23(h) application is made. Throughout this MDL, designated counsel have at various times performed common benefit work in relation to the PI/ wrongful death claims, as well as work related to the economic loss class claims. This application seeks an award as to the latter category only, and only from the \$34.5 million GM has agreed to pay (in addition to the class

fund) in this Class Settlement. This Declaration also is not a request for a particular allocation between and among counsel; it is limited to the Rule 23(h) purpose of supporting the reasonableness of the request for \$34.5 million.

7. Specifically, and limited under Rule 23(h) to activities that are directly class related, a look at the lodestar of those lawyers with Court-appointed roles for the Economic Loss Class Action in work devoted to the class action (with other downward revisions, explained below) reveals a minimum of \$78,148,898.77 in lodestar for purposes of the cross-check (“Lodestar”). The total lodestar is significantly higher. A look at unreimbursed expenses with those same parameters is \$9,914,727.94 (“Costs”).

8. The \$24,585,272.06 in class-related fees requested, compared to the \$78,148,898.77 in Lodestar, yields a *negative multiplier* of 0.31, and represents only 16.8% of the net constructive common fund (the Settlement Fund plus the fees and costs that New GM has agreed to pay, less counsel’s \$9,914,727.94 requested cost reimbursement), or 15.8% of the gross constructive common fund (without removal of the requested cost reimbursement). The average hourly rate in this Lodestar is \$509.89; and 31% of this rate—corresponding to the relationship of the \$78,148,898.77 (Lodestar) to \$24,585,272.06 (the \$34.5 million minus the Costs) (*i.e.*, 31%)—yields an effective average hourly rate of less than \$160/ hour (\$158.07).

9. The \$34.5 million will not come close to reimbursing the lawyers—including those noted above and other Participating Counsel<sup>2</sup>—for six years of diligent, extensive, and efficient work in a hard-fought case against aggressive defendants in multiple courts involving numerous risky and difficult issues, where, despite all risks and challenges, Plaintiffs have

---

<sup>2</sup> See Order No. 13.

secured a \$121.1 million recovery for the Class. By any and all metrics courts use to determine the fairness of fees and costs, Plaintiffs' request is fair and reasonable.

**Monthly Time and Expense Submission and Review**

10. In Order No. 13, this Court set forth time-keeping and cost keeping protocols for lawyers reporting time in this MDL, under the direction and supervision of Co-Lead Counsel. All timekeepers were required to "accurately and contemporaneously" record their time and expenses, which should indicate "with specificity the hours and billing rate, along with a brief note indicating the source of authorization for the activity in question and a brief description of the particular activity." Dkt. No. 304 at 11. Lead Counsel were required to collect time submissions from Participating Counsel on a monthly basis. *Id.* Order No. 13 also set forth a standardized Task Code system and an expense categorization system. *Id.*, Addenda A and B.

11. Pursuant to Order No. 13, timekeepers submitted detailed monthly time and expense reports to Lief Cabraser. The Monthly Time Report and Expense Report templates that Lief Cabraser provided to timekeepers are attached as **Exhibits A and B**, respectively. The time reports used timekeepers' normal hourly rates; thus, overall time calculated now, based on records from August 2014 through July 2020,<sup>3</sup> reflects historical (not current) rates.

12. Lief Cabraser utilized experienced personnel members, working under my and my partners' direction, to collect, review, and (using best reasonable efforts) audit common benefit submissions on a monthly basis to ensure that they were facially compliant with Order No. 13. Specifically, these personnel reviewed all submissions to confirm that the submitted time was specifically authorized, appropriately categorized (for example, that a deposition was in

---

<sup>3</sup> Time for August 2020 and forward is not yet audited. In addition, of course, there will be ongoing work in connection with this Settlement through and after final approval. As this necessary additional work is performed, the requested award will reflect an ever-decreasing percentage of the lodestar.

a deposition category, not inadvertently in a briefing category), timely submitted, and adequately detailed.

13. If the reviewers identified a deficiency in any time submission, they would communicate with the submitting firm and permit the firm to re-submit the time entry. No modifications were made by Co-Lead Counsel to any firm's submission without that firm's express authorization. Detailed time and cost reports were previously submitted to the Court, *in camera*, on February 5, 2016 and January 3, 2019 to apprise the Court of the nature and scope of the work performed under Order No. 13. Likewise, here, should the Court wish to review *in camera* any of the detailed time records or cost records underlying the amounts recited in this Fee Motion, they are available.

14. In addition to keeping the submissions in the form in which they were submitted, once a submission was in facial compliance with the Court's Order No. 13, the time and expenses were uploaded to a database that collects and stores the time and expenses of all submitting firms. This database allows our team to generate reports based on specified parameters or combinations of parameters (*e.g.*, firm name, attorney name, date, task code, and search terms), and was used to generate the data contained in this Declaration and the accompanying Fee Motion.

**Further Time and Expense Review In Accordance with Order No. 13 In Connection with this Rule 23(h) Submission**

15. Lief Cabraser attorneys and staff conducted another high-level audit of these entries immediately prior to and in connection with submission of this Motion. The purpose of this review was to present, and to thus allow this Court to confirm, the time and expenses reasonably devoted to the economic loss class action litigation. This way, the Court can “cross

check” the Lodestar with the modest percent of the constructive common fund Plaintiffs are seeking in fees, and examine the costs expended.

16. As backdrop, throughout this litigation, Co-Lead Counsel implemented internal protocols and procedures to ensure that the litigation was run as efficiently as possible, and to ensure the work involved in the litigation was value additive, cost-effective, and non-duplicative.

17. In all tasks, Co-Lead Counsel allocated responsibility among the various firms carefully to avoid unnecessary or duplicative work. This work is set forth in Mr. Berman’s declaration.

18. Co-Lead Counsel made every effort to litigate efficiently by assigning work to the lowest billing timekeepers where feasible. Tasks were delegated appropriately among partners, associate attorneys, paralegals, and other staff according to their complexity. Where necessary, projects were assigned to experienced lawyers with depth in the field who could effectively and efficiently manage and run such projects.

19. In addition to the efficient staffing throughout, Plaintiffs here, for purposes of a conservative examination of class action Lodestar and Costs, are presenting time and costs as follows and under these specifications:

- a. *First*, Plaintiffs present time and costs only of those with current Court-appointed (*see* Order Nos. 8, 13) or Bankruptcy Designated economic loss roles. This is not to suggest that the collective work of Participating Counsel is irrelevant, but that, to the contrary, even if a more discrete group is examined for purposes of the lodestar cross-check, the Lodestar is a negative multiplier. The time presented is from Co-Leads with responsibility for economic loss (Lieff Cabraser and Hagens

Berman), the current Executive Committee, Designated Bankruptcy Counsel Brown Rudnick, and Plaintiff Liaison Counsel and their firms.

- b. *Second*, Plaintiffs removed substantive categories of time where *all* the work was *necessarily* common benefit, but *not* class action related, work, *i.e.*, the PI/WD bellwether trial prep and trial time (categories 16 and 17).<sup>4</sup> With respect to costs, because there was no analogous category for PI/WD bellwether trials, in an abundance of caution, and the interests of application of a clear parameter, Plaintiffs removed entries which included the word “bellwether” (or variants thereof). In addition, Plaintiffs removed the courtroom set-up trial fees (located in the “Miscellaneous” category).
- c. *Third*, based on an audit, Plaintiffs removed certain entries that did not comport with the parameters of Order No. 13, *e.g.*, travel time where other work was not being contemporaneously performed.
- d. *Fourth*, Plaintiffs then took a global 5% reduction of time and eliminated the small amount of time reported in the “Miscellaneous” time category. While perhaps arbitrary sounding, the 5% reflects certain realities, *e.g.*, no matter how careful, in a case spanning six years, nearly 100,000 lines of time entry (at 4,000 pages), and the litigation of multiple complicated issues in this Court and the Bankruptcy Court, there may be some so-called passive review time; that is, time that arguably is related to a task but arguably falls just outside of it through no intention of the time-keeper.

---

<sup>4</sup> Time submitted in the “Science” category (category 13) was also not included.



e. *Finally*, this time is (a) historical not current, and (b) incomplete, in that it leaves out ongoing time as well as time and costs before the August 15, 2014 appointment of Counsel pursuant to Order No. 8. This latter figure amounts to hundreds of hours of lodestar devoted to factual investigation, rigorous legal analysis, and working with Plaintiffs, and preparation of complaints that were transferred to this MDL. Ongoing work will include extensive communications with Class members, work on final approval, and other.

20. This process yields extremely conservative Lodestar and Cost aggregates in this long and hard-fought litigation, with substantial time and expenses necessarily incurred for the benefit of the economic loss class. The lodestar cross-check presented in this declaration demonstrates the fairness of the requested percentage fee/cost award. Counsel will receive substantially less than their hourly rates, not more, for work they performed in a challenging and risky case where counsel are seeking only a modest percent of the constructive common fund.

**Time and Expenses Submitted in Support of the Motion**

21. Under the parameters set forth in the above paragraph, and to inform the Court's lodestar cross-check and demonstrate that the requested fees/costs request is an eminently reasonable one without any hint of a "windfall," there are 170,669 hours of time by the indicated, limited set of timekeeper firms between August 15, 2014 and July 31, 2020. The lodestar resulting from those hours, applying a 5% across-the-board reduction, is \$78,148,898.77 ("Lodestar")—significantly more than the attorneys' fees requested.

22. In my role as Co-Lead Counsel, I am familiar with all of the work done in this case in terms of both quality and quantity, and the contributions of the law firms that worked on behalf of the Class. It is my professional opinion that a Lodestar of \$78,148,898.77 (or higher) is reasonable in amount and necessary for the effective and efficient prosecution and resolution of

the litigation. This Lodestar, less than the total dedicated to the class action, reflects the intensive and ongoing efforts of a tenacious team of counsel that steadfastly prosecuted the claims of the Class and ultimately contributed to the resolution of this case.

23. The weighted average billing rate associated with this Lodestar is \$457.89.

24. The hours and Lodestar for 16 category codes designated in Order No. 13 (excluding two bellwether-related categories and the science category), taking into account a 5% across-the-board reduction in Lodestar, is detailed in Table 1 below.

**Table 1**

<b>Category Code</b>	<b>Total Hours</b>	<b>Total Lodestar</b>
<b>1 – Lead and/or Liaison Counsel Calls/Meetings</b>	563.1	\$496,172.18
<b>2 – Executive Committee Calls/Meetings</b>	321.8	\$239,490.73
<b>3 – Lead/Liaison Duties</b>	8,052.4	\$3,064,690.03
<b>4 - Administrative</b>	10,079.6	\$3,304,518.76
<b>5 - MDL Status Conf.</b>	1,169.6	\$882,293.88
<b>6 - Court Appearance</b>	1,933.8	\$1,365,241.20
<b>7 – Research</b>	3,270.7	\$1,497,203.23
<b>8 – Discovery</b>	8,524.0	\$3,608,598.94
<b>9 - Doc. Review</b>	59,398.8	\$21,697,512.84
<b>10 - Litigation Strategy &amp; Analysis</b>	3,474.1	\$2,326,500.13
<b>11 - Dep. Prep/Taken/Defend</b>	31,747.4	\$14,660,981.88
<b>12 - Pleadings/Briefs/Pretrial Motions/Legal</b>	32,460.5	\$18,561,400.77
<b>14 – Experts/Consultants</b>	3,685.2	\$2,127,898.64
<b>15 - Settlement</b>	4,204.3	\$3,214,845.51
<b>18 - Appeal</b>	1,783.7	\$1,101,550.08
<b>Total</b>	<b>170,669.0</b>	<b>\$78,148,898.77</b>

25. A discussion of the work undertaken in certain major categories underscores its contribution to the class settlement. Document/ESI review and analysis, for example, comprises the largest portion of the total hours billed. This work was critical to the litigation efforts. To

begin the process, Counsel first established a detailed document review protocol and nuanced coding panel with dozens of fields. Counsel then spent significant time training all attorneys analyzing produced documents in the details of the case and the coding panel to ensure the categorization was as efficient and useful as possible. Those attorneys then carefully reviewed, coded, and annotated more than 4.3 million documents, totaling over 23.4 million pages, many of which were highly technical in nature. The information discerned from this review and analysis was used extensively in the litigation for the purpose of: (1) crafting additional discovery requests; (2) amending the consolidated complaint; (3) supporting the class certification briefing and experts; (4) identifying deponents; (5) preparing deposition outlines; and (6) assisting settlement efforts and presentations.

26. Significant hours were also expended for deposition work and scores of legal briefs and pleadings. The scope of this litigation, as well as the parallel proceedings in bankruptcy court, required substantial briefing: thousands of pages were submitted to this Court, the bankruptcy Court, and the Second Circuit. In terms of depositions, Plaintiffs took *117* depositions of New GM personnel, of which Counsel for the Economic Loss Plaintiffs were the lead examiners in 103; they defended another 94 Plaintiff depositions. Counsel for the Economic Loss Plaintiffs also defended all the class representative depositions and engaged in substantial expert deposition work, virtually all of which was staffed with one lawyer only. Tasks related to depositions included, among others: (1) identifying potential deponents, (2) conducting thorough research to identify, analyze, and distill complex documents relevant to each deposition, (3) drafting and refining outlines and other preparation efforts, (4) preparing the class member and expert witnesses in advance of the depositions, (5) traveling to and from

depositions around the country, (6) taking or defending the depositions, and (7) reviewing and analyzing deposition transcripts.

27. The hourly rates reported by the timekeepers were directed to be the usual and customary rates set by each firm for each of the firm's participants in this type of litigation. The firms' hourly rates are based on the timekeepers' skill, experience, reputation, and expertise, and the billing rates approved by courts in other similar complex class action cases, including other consumer class actions. The rates submitted by each firm ranged from \$210-805 for associates and senior associates (with a weighted average of approximately \$452), and \$350-1565 for partners (with a weighted average of approximately \$770). In my professional judgment and experience, these rates are in line with market rates reported and awarded in this type of litigation.

28. To use my firm as an example, Lief Cabraser's hourly rates have periodically been negotiated with and paid on an hourly basis by sophisticated commercial entities, and federal courts throughout the country have approved Lief Cabraser's standard billing rates and reimbursement of costs as reasonable.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., *In re Bank of N.Y. Mellon Corp. Forex Transactions Litig.*, No. 1:14-cv-05496, Dkt. 98 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 24, 2015); *In re: Toyota Motor Corp. Unintended Acceleration Marketing, Sales Practices, and Products Liability Litig.*, No. 10-ml-02151, Dkt. No. 3933 (C.D. Cal. June 24, 2013) (awarding requested fees and finding that "[c]lass counsel's experience, reputation, and skill, as well as the complexity of the case" justified billing rates); *Campbell et al. v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. 13-05996, Dkt. No. 253 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2017) (approving LCHB rates); *In re: Sears, Roebuck & Co. Front-Loading Washer Prods. Liab. Litig.*, No. 06- 7023, Dkt. 598 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 13, 2016) (awarding requested rates), *reversed and remanded on other grounds*, 867 F.3d 791 (7th Cir. 2017); *Allagas v. BP Solar Int'l, Inc.*, 2016 WL 9114162, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2016) (awarding requested fees after lodestar crosscheck, and concluding that the firm's "hourly rates, used to calculate the lodestar here, are in line with prevailing rates in this District and have recently been approved by federal and state courts"); *In re High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litig.*, No. 11-02509, Dkt. No. 1112 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 2, 2015) (approving LCHB rates); *In re Bank of America Credit Protection Marketing & Sales Practices Litig.*, No. 11-md-2269 THE (Dkt. 96) (N.D. Cal. Jan. 16, 2013); *Hale v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, No. 12-660, 2018 WL 6606079, at \*13-14 (S.D. Ill. Dec. 16, 2018); *In re: Whirlpool Corp. Front-loading Washer Prods. Liab. Litig.*, No. 08-65000, 2016 WL 5338012, at \*25 (N.D. Ohio Sept. 23, 2016); *Composite Co, Inc. v. Am. Int'l Grp., Inc.*, No. 1:13-cv-10491, Dkt. 157, at 7 (D. Mass Apr. 21, 2016).

29. Using the conservative parameters described above, Plaintiffs further seek reimbursement of \$9,914,727.94 million in unreimbursed class action litigation expenses incurred between August 15, 2014 and July 31, 2020, inclusive. Again, this figure reflects reasonable efforts to remove expenses associated with the bellwether trials.<sup>6</sup>

30. In Table 2, below, those costs are broken down by the Court-approved categories in Order No. 13.

**Table 2**

<b>Order No. 13 Category</b>	<b>Costs</b>
<b>1</b> – [Unreimbursed] <sup>7</sup> Assessment Fees	\$7,209,460.51
<b>2</b> - Federal Express / Local Courier, etc.	\$33,780.63
<b>3</b> - Postage Charges	\$4,347.19
<b>4</b> - Facsimile Charges	\$232.54
<b>5</b> - Long Distance	\$20,440.37
<b>6</b> - In-House Photocopying	\$372,515.35
<b>7</b> - Outside Photocopying	\$40,454.22
<b>8</b> – Hotels	\$392,733.16
<b>9</b> – Meals	\$50,970.78
<b>10</b> – Mileage	\$2,576.32
<b>11</b> - Air Travel	\$314,316.75
<b>12</b> - Deposition Costs/Expert Witnesses/Other	\$15,335.65
<b>13</b> - Lexis/Westlaw	\$339,621.27
<b>14</b> - Court Fees	\$13,124.98
<b>15</b> - Witness / Expert Fees	\$605,657.07
<b>16</b> - Investigation Fees / Service Fees	\$95,907.10
<b>17</b> – Transcripts	\$183,274.56
<b>18</b> - Ground Transportation (i.e., Rental)	\$78,093.03
<b>19</b> - Miscellaneous <sup>8</sup>	\$138,185.30
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9,914,727.94</b>

<sup>6</sup> Specifically, Lief Cabraser removed all expenses containing the word “bellwether,” or common misspellings of or shorthand for bellwether (“bell weather,” “bellweather,” “bell wether,” and “bw”).

<sup>7</sup> Court-appointed Counsel were assessed and advanced substantial cost contributions to pay for the work of the MDL. This Court previously authorized the reimbursement to the Executive Committee of their assessments and the partial reimbursement to Lead Counsel. Order No. 126 (July 12, 2017) and Common Benefit Order Fund Disbursement Order (Feb. 3, 2017).

<sup>8</sup> This is mostly comprised of substantial and specific expenses in particular subcategories: document management and word processing (\$88,162.95), research (\$19,749.64), mediation fees (\$12,776), and PACER fees (\$5,170.20). These subcategories alone amount to \$125,858.79 of the miscellaneous expenses.

31. In my professional opinion, the figures are unsurprising and reasonable. For example, the large expenditures for witnesses and experts was foreseeable given the intensity of the litigation and the technical nature of the case. To effectively prosecute this case, Co-Lead Counsel employed eight experts who submitted 16 expert reports collectively exceeding 1,000 pages. In addition to the significant undertakings necessary to complete their opening and rebuttal reports, each of these experts also spent significant time preparing for depositions and being deposed, and advising and assisting in Class Counsel's offensive and defensive *Daubert* briefing efforts.

32. Also, given this was a nationwide case as well as a complex one, expenditures for lodging and travel reflecting discovery and depositions all across the country was unsurprising. There were depositions across the country of 117 fact witnesses, 94 Class Representatives, and 26 experts.

33. It is Lieff Cabraser's policy and practice to prepare records from expense vouchers, check records, credit card records, and other source materials. Based on my oversight of Lieff Cabraser's and other firms' work in connection with this litigation and my review of these records, I believe them to constitute an accurate record of the expenses actually incurred by the firms. Itemized expense reports are available for review by the Court should the Court deem it appropriate.

\*\*\*

34. For the foregoing reasons, and those outlined in Plaintiffs' Fee Motion, Plaintiffs seek reimbursement of \$9,914,727.94 in class-related costs and \$24,585,272.06 in class-related fees (the latter reflecting a negative multiplier of 0.31 on work performed for the benefit of the class), for a total Rule 23(h) award of \$34.5 million. This is an aggregate application, to be

allocated as subsequently proposed by Plaintiffs' Co-Lead Economic Class Counsel and approved by the Court, among the designated Counsel who incurred costs, performed services, and reported time under Order No. 13 for the benefit of the economic loss settlement class in this MDL and in the related bankruptcy proceedings.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the forgoing is true and correct.

Executed in Sebastopol, California, this 28th day of September 2020.

/s/ Elizabeth J. Cabraser  
Elizabeth J. Cabraser

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true copy of the above document was served upon the attorney of record for each other party through the Court's electronic filing service on September 28, 2020, which will send notification of such filing to the e-mail addresses registered.

*/s/ Steve W. Berman*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Steve W. Berman



# **EXHIBIT A**

**IN RE GM IGNITION SWITCH LITIGATION, MDL NO. 2543  
MONTHLY TIME REPORT**

Quarter/Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Firm Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Categories:** 1. Lead and/or Liaison Calls/Meetings 2. Executive Committee Calls/Meetings 3. Lead/Liaison Duties 4. Administrative 5. MDL Status Conf. 6. Court Appearance 7. Research 8. Discovery 9. Doc. Review 10. Litigation Strategy & Analysis 11. Dep: Prep/Taken/Defend 12. Pleadings/Briefs/Pre-trial Motions/Legal 13. Science 14. Experts/Consultants 15. Settlement 16. Trial Prep/Bellwether 17. Trial 18. Appeal 19. Miscellaneous (describe)

Firm ID:	Last Name, First Name	Professional level: Partner (PT), Associate (A), Contract (C), or Paralegal (PR)	Date of Service:	Category Code:	Category Name:	Detailed Description of Work performed:	Work Assigned by or Approved by:	Billing Rate:	Time spent (by 0.1 increments)	Fees Total:

Category Name	Total Time per Category	Total Fees per Category
Lead and/or Liaison Calls/Meeting		
Executive Committee Calls/Meeting		
Lead/Liaison Duties		
Administrative		
MDL Status Conf.		
Court Appearance		
Research		
Discovery		
Doc. Review		
Litigation Strategy & Analysis		
Dep: Prep/Take/Defend		
Pleadings/Briefs, Pretrial Motions, Legal		
Science		
Experts/Consultants		
Settlement		
Trial Prep/Bellwether		
Trial		
Appeal		
Total:		

# **EXHIBIT B**

